UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,023	11/18/2003	Sanjeev Nath	NATL-103	5567

7590 03/29/2005

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
HUANG, SIHONG	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2632	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,023	NATH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sihong Huang	2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 11, "pm" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the specification, on pages 1 and 3, a co-pending parent application number is missing.

"10/704,456" should be added.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 2, 6 and 8, the preamble "The method" lacks antecedent basis. In addition, preamble of dependent claim should be consistent with the preamble of the independent claim. In this case, "The method" should read "The system".

Claim 6 is vague and indefinite because it doesn't end with an end period.

In claims 14-16, "the metered zone" in line 5 of claim 14, in line 6 of claim 15 and in line 7 of claim 16 each lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Katz (US Pub. No. 2002/0109610 A1).

Regarding claims 1-3, Dee discloses a system (see Fig. 1) for enforcement of parking regulations with respect to vehicles (11) situated in a metered zone (12), said system comprising: a meter (65, Fig. 6) comprising a wireless monitoring device (50, Fig. 5, pp 0053) and a transceiver (60, pp 0035, pp 0058 and pp 0060, pp 0078); a vehicle control system (10, Figs. 2A and 2B); a device (30, 40, pp 0050).

Regarding claim 5, Katz further discloses a camera (pp 0061).

Regarding claim 6, Katz discloses the transmission of a vehicle ID number (pp 0043, pp 0064, pp 0065 and pp 0067).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, the system and method of Katz as disclosed in claim 1 is inherently reducing the utilization of human resources and operation cost associated with the issuance of summons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz (US Pub. No. 2002/0109610 A1).

Regarding claim 4, Katz differs from claim 4 in that it doesn't disclose the type of signal generated by the vehicle control system (portable transceiver 10). However, Fig. 1 of Katz clearly shows a wireless signal, the recited forms in claim 4 are well known types in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ such well known technology to the system of Katz for a simple design of the portable transponder 10.

Regarding claim 7, Katz differs from claim 7 in that it does not disclose that the meter transmits a meter unique identifier to the vehicle control system. However, Katz discloses communication can be established between the meter and portable transceiver (pp 0060), each meter is uniquely identified in the system (pp 0034), in order to show (e.g., to meter monitor 41, see Fig. 1) and confirm (to the parked vehicle owner or portable transceiver 10) to which meter the vehicle is parked, the meter ID should be sent to and stored in the vehicle control system (portable transceiver 10). Whether or not such data is sent directly from the meter or directly from the central computer system (30) is merely a matter of design choice and an obvious modification to the system of Katz.

Regarding claim 8, Katz doesn't disclose that the meter transmits information to the vehicle control system to inform the operator of the vehicle that the vehicle is stationary/parked/idling in the metered zone. However, as disclosed above to claim 7, the

meter of Katz communicates with the vehicle control system (portable transceiver 10) (pp 0060). Katz further discloses that the system 30 can be configured to send message to the portable transceiver 10 to inform the user of parking related information (pp 0019, 0073, 0074, 0045, 0046). It would have been obvious for the system of Katz to send/transmit information to remind or inform the user of expiring purchased time and/or further payment can't be received while the vehicle detector still detects the presence of the vehicle. Whether or not such information is transmitted directly from the meter or directly from the central computer system (30) is merely a matter of design choice and an obvious modification to the system of Katz.

Regarding claims 9, 11 and 12, the meter of Katz inherently includes a time-lapse recorder for such function is conventional to a meter. Although Katz does not disclose a shock/vibration/sound/impact sensor in the meter, it's common that a meter includes a tamper detector/sensor (e.g., motion sensor) to monitor any tampering action toward the meter. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate shock/vibration/sound/impact sensor in the meter to protect and prevent the meter from tampering.

Regarding claim 10, although Katz does not disclose a plurality of surveillance cameras mounted facing all four directions, it's common to provide surveillance cameras in parking area to cover and protect the whole parking area. Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide surveillance cameras around the parking meters of the system of Katz to protect the parked vehicles and their owners.

9. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz in view of Brusseaux et al. (US Pat. No. 6,104,299).

Regarding claim 13, Katz differs from claim 13 in that it does not disclose that the wireless monitoring device monitors volume and flow of traffic to co-ordinate traffic light sequencing for optimum traffic movement. However, Brusseaux et al, from the same field of endeavor, disclose incorporating other sensors/detectors (13, 23) to parking meters (10, 20) for monitoring other conditions surrounding the parking meters area and further controlling traffic light (40) sequencing base upon the result of the sensors/detectors. Base on this teaching, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate other sensors (such as traffic monitors, volume and flow) in the parking meters of Katz to monitor additional conditions around the parking meters. One motivation for such modification is that parking meters are readily available, offer dense geographical coverage and are connected in a centralized network which make it easier and cheaper to implement other monitoring function/system without significant modification to the metering system (col. 2, lines 12-28).

Regarding claim 14, as addressed above to claims 1 and 13, Katz discloses a system comprising a meter, a vehicle control system and a device. Katz differs from claim 14 in that Katz does not disclose monitoring emission from a vehicle by the meter. However, as discussed in claim 13, Brusseaux et al. teach that pollution sensors (13, 23) can be incorporated into a parking meter (10, 20) for monitoring emission from vehicle(s) for a simple and low cost system (col. 1, lines 10-15, 46-54 and col. 2, lines 1-5). Base

on this teaching, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate pollution sensors in the parking meters of Katz to monitor emission from vehicle. One motivation for such modification is that parking meters are readily available, offer dense geographical coverage and are connected in a centralized network which make it easier and cheaper to implement other monitoring function/system without significant modification to the metering system (col. 2, lines 12-28).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Howard (US Pub. No. 2002/0109611 A1) and Dee (US Pub. No. 2002/0008639 A1) are cited to show other automatic parking payment/management systems.

Roberts (US Pat. No. 4,297,683) is cited to show vandal alarm system for parking meters.

Bahar (US Pub. No. 2003/0132840 A1) is cited to show an enhanced parking meter utilizing user ID technology.

Puckett (US Pat. No. 5,829,913) is cited to show a bollard with plurality of surveillance cameras.

Yoo et al. (US Pat. No. 6,107,942) and Trajkovic et al. (US Pat. No. 6,426,708 B1) are cited to show parking area with surveillance cameras.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sihong Huang whose telephone number is 571-272-2958. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Thu & Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on 571-272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sihong Huang
March 19, 2005